

Republican, Monarchical and Despotism, that had gone before them, and were, then, as now, known only as things that once existed, they were taught to practice upon the precepts: "Put not your trust in Princes nor in the sons of men, for there is no salvation in them." They demanded the strong bond of two-thirds, as a safeguard to their interests. They obtained the insertion of the article I have quoted, or they never would have become parties to the contract. And are we, their descendants, bone of their bone, and flesh of their flesh, entitled by all the rules of law that have obtained among civilized nations, and by common sense, to the full benefits of this compact, because we demand a faithful observance of its terms, or to be absolved entirely from its obligations, to be classed among secessionists? Let no man charge me with being the advocate of nullification or secession!

In that dark and gloomy day when South Carolina raised the flag of Nullification, I condemned her doctrine. I feel but little sympathy with her notions of secession now, because I believe the General Government will faithfully carry out all the provisions of the late compromise. Enough of this. I will only remark, if gentlemen would but exercise the faculty of reasoning for a moment, they will find there is no more analogy between secession as proposed by South Carolina, and the resolution offered, some months ago, by the gentleman from Dorset, than there is between darkness and light. It was put in juxta position, and was designed as a set off to the proposition of the gentleman from Baltimore city, (Mr. Presstman,) who proposed to abrogate the 59th article of the Constitution, and maintained the right, if the contract was to be dissolved, that each of the contracting parties should be restored to their original position. It breathed not the language of menace nor threat, but in the spirit of amity and peace responded, if our union is unpleasant or disagreeable, let there be no strife between us. You go to the West and we will take to the East. The head and front of the entire movement hath this extent—no more.

Having shown, sir, the terms upon which the people of the Eastern Shore were induced to enter into this government, and insisting upon a strict adherence to those terms, it is not only candid, but affords me unaffected pleasure to admit that there is no part of the contract, I mean it is not so nominated in the bond, that the Governor should come alternately from the two shores. That they were thus alternated, was a matter of controversy, which the people of the Western Shore were willing to manifest towards their fellow-citizens of the Eastern Shore. This practice commenced at the beginning of our Government, and, sanctioned by uniform usage, continued up to the memorable epoch of the year 1836. Originating with the *Fathers of the Republic*—whose expanded views soared far above the narrow conception of subjecting every thing to this Procrustean process, whose patriotic minds held in contempt such idle abstractions and Utopian theories, men of

practical common sense, appreciating liberty and its concomitant blessings, because they had encountered every privation, and periled their fortunes and their lives in its achievement. This practice, emanating from this high source, continued to be as religiously observed as though it were part and parcel of the Constitution itself, throughout the whole intervening time, from the foundation of the Government to the year 1836. What, let me ask, is it, but an abstraction—an idle phantasy of the brain—to be engaged in apportioning localities, and adjusting the forms of Government to equal numbers—equal to-day and unequal to-morrow—varying as caprice, the avocations of trade, or the thousand controlling circumstances of human actions may suggest?

Are we to revive the principle of the Gracchi—the Agrarian system tested in ancient Rome, and exploded centuries ago? Are we to follow in the wake of changing, fluctuating France—wheeling about—turning about and revolutionizing—having every thing as unfitted and uncertain as the elements around us. We, the recipients of the richest heritage ever bequeathed to any nation—offering an asylum of peace and rest to the down-trodden and oppressed of every clime; we, whose example hitherto has been to all nations struggling for freedom, as a cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night, are we now to descend from our high position—lose the respect of all mankind, and become the servile imitators of fickle, frivolous, imbecile France, whose form of Government in the lifetime of one individual, has undergone thirteen different mutations?

The subtle, flexible politician, Talleyrand, whose adroitness enabled him to survive all these mutations and transmutations—even he, with all his heartlessness, became wearied, and when the oath of allegiance had been taken for the thirteenth time, prayed God it might be the last.

Mr. President, (continued Mr. D.,) when I see a man, versed in public affairs, devoting the best energies of his heart and mind, in the conscientious discharge of his sacred obligations to his country, his God, and truth—to such a man I bow in deference, and welcome him into the inmost recesses of my heart. But when I hear a man pronouncing the name of the people triflingly on his lips, whilst unmitigated tyranny rankles in his bosom, using his fellow only as a ladder to scale the height of his own ambitious aspirations—such a man is my perfect scorn, utter detestation,—object of my implacable disgust.

A few moments since, I had no idea I should now be addressing the house. I never enter this hall with a prepared speech, with set phrases, nor premeditated hisses. A plain, blunt man, I speak right on, as the occasion may require,—nothing extenuating nor ought setting down in malice, and, something like that quiet and peace-loving sect, only when moved by the spirit. Indisposed, as I have been, and as I now am, prudence perhaps would have dictated to me silence at this time; and sure I am, not